

8N



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,798	07/25/2003	Guang-Der Tang	BHT-3223-29	1424

7590 01/10/2005

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
SUITE 1404
5205 LEESBURG PIKE
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041

EXAMINER

TRIEU, THERESA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3748

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SP

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/626,798	TARNG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Theresa Trieu	3748	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on October 21, 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is responsive to the applicants' amendment filed on October 21, 2004.

Claims 1-10 have been canceled. Claims 11-19 have been added. Thus, claims 11-19 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tarng et al. (Tarng) (Patent Number 6,039,549).

Regarding claims 11, 16 and 18, as shown in Figs. 2 and 3, Tarng discloses a pumping structure of a scroll compressor with a coolant comprising : a block (14) connected to an interior of a casing of the compressor ; a fixed scroll (11); an orbiting scroll (10) rotating around the fixed scroll ; each of plurality positioning seats (24) being spaced apart around an exterior circumference of the fixed scroll ; each of plurality of suppressor (29) being connected to a top of one of the plurality of positioning seats and positioning the fixed scroll relative to the block ; an Oldham ring (13) including a positioning part fixed to the block (14) ; a stand ring (not numbered ; however, clearly seen in Fig. 2) connecting each of the plurality of positioning seats (24) to the block (14).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. *Claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarnng '549.*

Tarnng discloses the invention as recited above; however, Tarnng fails to disclose the suppressors, the positioning seats, the stand ring and the bolts are integrated in one piece. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have utilize the suppressors, the positioning seats, the stand ring and the bolts being integrated in one piece, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has

Art Unit: 3748

formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art.

Howard v. Detroit Stove Works, 150 U.S. 164 (1893).

3. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarng '549.

Tarng discloses the invention as recited above; however, Tarng fails to disclose the stand ring is fixedly connected by a plurality of bolts.

However, where a product by process claim is rejected over a prior art product that appears to be identical, although produced by a different process, the burden is upon the applicants to come forward with evidence establishing an obvious difference between the two. *See In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289 (Fed.Cir. 1983). In addition, a claim for an article capable of such definition must define the article by its structure and not by the process of making it. Since the claimed stand ring is capable of structural definition, the patentability of the claims must be determined solely on the basis of recited structure, exclusive of process recitations. *In re Johnson*, 394 F.2d 591, 157 USPQ 620, 55 CCPA 1463.

4. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarng '549 in view of Chang (Patent Number 5,527,166).

Tarng discloses the invention as recited above; however, Tarng fails to disclose the each of the plurality of positioning seats has a rest seat.

As shown in Fig. 1, Chang teaches that it is conventional in the art to utilize the rest seat (66) corresponding to one of a plurality of grooves (60) on a bottom of the fixed scroll (22); the stand ring (42), the plurality of positioning seats (46) and each of the rest seat (66) being integrated in one piece. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made, to have utilized the rest seat, as taught by Chang in the Tarnng apparatus, since the use of thereof would have limited the descending level of the fixed scroll.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Theresa Trieu whose telephone number is 571-272-4868. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am- 5:00pm.

Art Unit: 3748

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas E Denion can be reached on 571-272-4859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TT



Theresa Trieu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3748